DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 007 HE 007 816

AUTHOR Smart, John C.
TITLE Professors and Unions: A Study of Collective Bargaining in the Academic Profession.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 76
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 23, 1976)
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Institutional Research, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; Collective Negotiation; College Faculty; Conference Reports; Employer Employee Relationship; *Faculty Organizations; *Grievance Procedures; *Higher Education; National Surveys; Negotiation Impasses; Statistical Data; Tables (Data); Teacher Militancy; *Unions

ABSTRACT

The distinctive educational and occupational characteristics of postsecondary faculty affiliated with the American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Teachers, and National Education Association, and their colleagues not affiliated with a collective bargaining representative are examined. The sample consists of 53,029 faculty who responded to a national survey of postsecondary faculty conducted by the American Council on Education. The results of a stepwise, multiple discriminant analysis are used to indicate the likely position of each group on issues that could be included in collective bargaining agreements and the relative strength of each collective bargaining representative in the five types of postsecondary institutions proposed by the Carnegie Commission. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124007

HE

PROFESSORS AND UNIONS: A STUDY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

John C. Smart

Office of Institutional Research
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 816

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 23, 1976.

PROFESSORS AND UNIONS: A STUDY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

The literature of higher education and the halls of academe have been flooded in recent years by polemic debates about the appropriateness of collective bargaining by college and university faculty and the underlying causes and potential consequences of collective bargaining on campuses. It has been suggested, for example, that the rapid growth of this movement represents a response by faculty to the present era of retrenchment in higher education which threatens the job security and economic status of faculty, the emergence of powerful statewide boards which have shifted the locus of important decision making authority from the campus to the capitol, the passage of recent legislation which has formally granted the right of collective representation to public employees, and the era of student unrest in which many traditional faculty prerogatives were subjected to serious challenges. The postulated consequences of collective bargaining in the academic community include an improvement of faculty job security and enhancement of the economic status of the profession, an increase in the influence of faculty in the campus governance process, a remediation of past discrimination against minority and women faculty, a conferral of disproportionate power to bargaining representatives in campus issues, an increase in the centralization and bureaucratization of campus and statewide administrations, an inhibition of institutional innovation and responsiveness, and a greater polarization between faculty and administrators (5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 24).

While the perceived magnitude of these issues varies from writer to writer, most have shared a common tendency of assuming that these have been

universal causes and consequences. That is, there has been relatively little effort to examine variations within the collective bargaining movement which might suggest that these issues vary in relation to the bargaining organization and institutional affiliation of faculty. For example, Kemerer and Baldridge (15) have concluded that the "union advocate" typically lacks the doctorate, is a male of less than 40 years of age in either the humanities or social sciences, does not have tenure, has a greater teaching load and a lower salary than colleagues in graduate institutions, and so on. A somewhat similar profile was also found for union advocates in the California state colleges (12). While such profiles may accurately describe the typical union advocate, they are likely to mask wide variations between advocates of such different collective bargaining organizations as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and National Education Association (NEA).

This possibility appears highly probable given the distinctive histories and philosophies of the AAUP, AFT, and NEA (11, 20) and the broad diversity in the characteristics of faculty affiliated with these bargaining organizations (16). Furthermore, Ladd and Lipset concluded that the differences they found in the characteristics of AAUP, AFT, and NEA members "correspond to expectations formed on the basis of the organizations' past roles and ideologies" (16, p. 43). Such consistency between the distinctive roles and ideologies of bargaining organizations and the salient characteristics of their respective members suggests that there is wide variation within the collective bargaining movement and it behooves researchers to examine these variations more systematically in their efforts to assess the potential consequences of this phenomenon to the future of the academic community.

The research by Ladd and Lipset (16) represented a major contribution to this important area of inquiry. However, they have cautioned that more recent surveys are likely to discover changes in the distinctive characteristics of faculty affiliated with either the AAUP, AFT, or NEA since their study was conducted during the 1968-69 academic year, well before the collective bargaining movement emerged as a prominent part of American higher education (16, p. 43). In addition, their study did not examine whether the overall differences between faculty affiliated with these three bargaining organizations were consistent across different types of postsecondary institutions, an omission which appears to be particularly crucial since Light (18) has demonstrated the importance of institutional affiliation to the study of college and university faculty.

The primary purposes of this paper are to determine (a) if there are significant differences in the attitudes of faculty affiliated with either the AAUP, AFT, or NEA toward the contemporary issues within the academic community and the desired characteristics of their jobs and (b) if the resulting overall differences are consistent across different types of postsecondary institutions proposed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (6).

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Sample

This study was based on a stratified random sample of faculty who responded to an extensive questionnaire developed and administered by the American Council on Education (ACE). A thorough description of the ACE questionnaire, sampling procedure, and response rate has been presented by Bayer (4). The respondents (N=53,029) were affiliated with all types of postsecondary institutions and held appointments in virtually all sectors of the academic profession.

An attempt was made to select randomly 100 faculty who were affiliated with either the AAUP, AFT, or NEA at each of the four major types of post-secondary institutions (research universities, comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, two-year colleges and institutes) proposed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (6). The random selection procedures were constrained by the restriction that respondents must have indicated either "strongly disagree" or "disagree with reservations" to the following item in the ACE questionnaire: "Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university." The purpose of the sampling procedure was to obtain "pure types" (i.e., members of only one bargaining organization) who were "advocates" of the appropriateness of the collective bargaining movement. Table 1 presents the number of faculty included in this study, stratified by their collective bargaining organization and institutional affiliation.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Inspection of Table 1 shows that it was not possible to obtain a random sample of 100 faculty in two of the twelve cells. AFT members at liberal arts colleges (n = 10) were deleted from the study because of an inadequate sample size.

Variables

Persisting conflicts between faculty and institutions of higher education have been a primary impetus for the collective bargaining movement and a major portion of most existing bargaining agreements concerns the condition of faculty employment (e.g., salary, tenure and promotion criteria, etc.) (11, 17). Two sets of items in the ACE questionnaire were selected for this study since

they were related to areas of existing or potential conflict within the academic community and to the desired working conditions (i.e., job characteristics) of faculty. The first set of items asked faculty to indicate the importance (4 = essential, 3 = very important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important or detrimental) they would attach to 17 job characteristics if they were considering other academic career opportunities. The second set of items asked faculty to indicate their agreement (4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree with reservations, 2 = disagree with reservations, 1 = strongly disagree) with 28 issues related to current or potential controversies in the academic community and perceptions of their academic careers.

Statistical Analyses

Responses to the 45 items were factor analyzed by the principal axis method with unity in the diagonal. The linearity of eigenvalue curvature was examined by the scree test (8) which indicated that nine factors should be retained for rotation and analysis. An oblique rotation (22) was performed and factor scores were estimated and transformed to standard scores with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures (25) were used to examine the statistical significance of differences between faculty affiliated with the AAUP, AFT, or NEA and to determine if the resulting differences were consistent across the four types of postsecondary institutions. A four by three design was used. The independent variables were the four major types of postsecondary institutions proposed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (research universities, comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, two-year colleges and institutes) and the collective bargaining organization with which faculty were affiliated (AAUP, AFT, NEA).

The nine standard scores derived from the factor analysis constituted the dependent variables in the analysis.

RESULTS

Factor Analysis

The pattern matrix (factor weights) for the nine factor oblique solution is presented in Table 2. Only variables with a factor weight of $\pm$ .30 or greater were used to develop the following definitions of faculty who obtained a high score on each factor. The title of each factor was suggested by its pattern of loadings (factor weights).

(Insert Table 2 about here.)

Factor I ("Social Opportunities"). Faculty with a high score consider a better community, better housing, better schools for their children, better colleagues and students with whom to work, and better employment opportunities for their spouses as important criteria in their consideration of possible career opportunities.

Factor II ("Conservative Orientation"). Faculty with a high score agree that claims of discriminatory practices against women students have been greatly exaggerated and consider themselves to be politically conservative. They do not agree that there should be preferential hiring practices for minority and women faculty, students should have representation of institutional governing boards, faculty promotions should be based (in part) on formal student evaluations of their teaching, and part-time faculty should be eligible for tenure.

Factor III ("Research Opportunities"). Faculty with a high score consider more time for research, smaller teaching loads, and better research facilities as important criteria in their consideration of possible career opportunities.

Factor IV ("Success Orientation"). Faculty with a high score believe that they have been more successful than most men and women of comparable age in their respective academic disciplines.

Factor V ("Institutional Aid Orientation"). Faculty with a high score believe that federal aid to students (both undergraduate and graduate) should be channeled through institutions rather than be given directly to students.

Factor VI ("Status Opportunities"). Faculty with a high score consider higher academic rank, better chance for professional advancement, higher salary, and tenure as important criteria in their consideration of possible career opportunities.

Factor VII ("Promotion Orientation"). Faculty with a high score believe that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criteria in promotion and tenure decisions and perceive that this is, in fact, the norm in their respective institutions and departments. They agree that teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary basis for academic promotion and consider themselves to be religious individuals. They do not agree that institutional demands for research productivity interfere with their effectiveness as teachers or that it is difficult to achieve tenure in their disciplines if they do not publish.

Factor VIII ("Teaching Opportunities"). Faculty with a high score consider less pressure to publish, fewer administrative responsibilities, and more opportunities to teach as important considerations in their review of possible career opportunities. They agree that institutional demands for greater research interfere with their teaching effectiveness.

Factor IX ("Dissatisfaction Orientation"). Faculty with a high score agree that they would not choose an academic life or, at least, would choose another academic discipline if they could begin their careers anew.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicated that there were statistically significant differences between faculty affiliated with the four types of postsecondary institutions (F = 26.10, df = 27/2985) and faculty affiliated with the three collective bargaining organizations (F = 17.34, df = 18/2044).[1] Furthermore, there was a statistically significant ($p < .001$) interaction (F = 1.93, df = 45/4575) between institutional affiliation and collective bargaining organization affiliation which indicated that the overall differences between AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty were not consistent across the four types of postsecondary institutions.

Because of the significant interaction term, it was necessary to make separate interpretations of the differences between AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty at each of the four types of postsecondary institutions. Stepwise multiple discriminant analysis procedures (25) were used to examine the specific nature of the differences between AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty at each of the four institutional types.

---

1. Differences related to the institutional affiliation of faculty will not be presented since they are not a primary focus of this study and have been presented by Bayer (4). Institutional affiliation was included as a design factor in this study to permit the investigation of whether the differences that emerged due to the bargaining organization affiliation of faculty were consistent across the four types of postsecondary institutions (i.e., the interaction term).

Research Universities. Table 3 presents the group means for AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty at research universities and the step-down F-ratios of the dependent variables.[2]

(Insert Table 3 about here)

The step-down F-ratios in Table 3 indicated that the three faculty groups were significantly different on four of the nine variables. Faculty affiliated with the NEA obtained a significantly higher mean score on Promotion Orientation than either AAUP or AFT faculty, and AAUP faculty earned a significantly higher mean score on this variable than their colleagues affiliated with the AFT; AFT faculty earned a lower mean score on Conservative Orientation than AAUP and NEA faculty; and NEA faculty obtained a higher mean score on Status Opportunities and a lower mean score on Research Opportunities than AAUP and AFT faculty.

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities. The step-down F-ratios in Table 4 indicated that five of the nine variables contributed significantly to the differentiation between these three faculty groups.

(Insert Table 4 about here)

Faculty affiliated with the NEA obtained a significantly higher mean score on

2. The step-down F-test is a test of significance for each variable when the variance attributable to all preceding variables in the analysis has been removed (25). Tables 3 through 6 are of a similar format and present the group means for faculty associated with the respective collective bargaining organizations and the step-down F-ratios of the nine dependent variables in each of the analyses for faculty at the four types of postsecondary institutions. The variables are listed in each table in the order in which they entered the stepwise analysis.

Promotion Orientation, Conservative Orientation, Status Opportunities and Institutional Aid Orientation, and a lower mean score on Social Opportunities than AAUP and AFT faculty. There were no significant differences between faculty affiliated with the AAUP and AFT at comprehensive colleges and universities.

Liberal Arts Colleges. Inspection of the step-down F-ratios in Table 5 indicated that three variables contributed significantly to the differentiation between AAUP and NEA faculty at liberal arts colleges.

(Insert Table 5 about here)

Faculty affiliated with the NEA obtained a higher mean score on Promotion Orientation, Status Opportunities, and Teaching Opportunities than their colleagues affiliated with the AAUP.

Two-Year Colleges and Institutes. The step-down F-ratios in Table 6 indicated that two of the nine variables contributed significantly to the differentiation between these three faculty groups.

(Insert Table 6 about here)

Faculty affiliated with the AFT obtained a lower mean score on Institutional Aid Orientation than AAUP and NEA faculty, and NEA faculty had a higher mean score than AFT faculty on Promotion Orientation.

DISCUSSION

It was suggested that the failure of most research to examine the relative importance of alternative causes and consequences of collective bargaining and to explore differences in the characteristics of faculty associated with various bargaining organizations might tend to mask wide variations within the collective bargaining movement. This contention was supported by earlier research which reflected broad diversity in the histories and philosophies of the AAUP, AFT, and NEA (11, 20) and the consistency between the distinctive characteristics of faculty affiliated with the AAUP, AFT, and NEA and the respective organizations' traditional roles and ideologies (16). The results of this study provide further evidence that there are wide variations within the collective bargaining movement in terms of (a) the relative importance of issues that differentiate faculty affiliated with the three bargaining organizations at different types of colleges and universities and (b) the distinctive characteristics of faculty affiliated with the AAUP, AFT, and NEA.

Collective Bargaining Issues. The topics that differentiated faculty who were affiliated with the three bargaining organizations might be considered to belong to one of two categories. First, there are general issues which appear to cut across the institutional affiliations of faculty and to be related to some of the more pressing conditions in higher education which have been postulated to be general causes of the emergence and growth of the collective bargaining movement. For example, Kemerer and Baldridge succinctly note that "the drive to form unions seems to be a protective reaction against external economic and social pressures, as well as a reflection of deep and genuine concern over internal issues of governance, tenure, and grievance procedures" (15, p. 43). Foremost among the general issues are the attitudes of AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty related to the criteria used in promotion and

tenure proceedings since Promotion Orientation contributed significantly to the differentiation between faculty affiliated with these three bargaining organizations at all four types of postsecondary institutions. A second general issue would appear to be faculty desires to improve their opportunities for social, economic, and professional advancement since Status Opportunities contributed significantly to the differentiation between faculty affiliated with the AAUP, AFT, and NEA at all three types of four-year colleges and universities. A final general issue would appear to be faculty attitudes toward such governance policies as preferential hiring practices for minority and women, student representation on governing boards, and the eligibility of part-time faculty for tenure since Conservative Orientation contributed significantly to the differentiation between AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty at two types of postsecondary institutions. In sum, these three general issues and the specific items they encompass appear to be directly related to the general conditions that Kemerer and Baldridge (15) and others (5, 20, 24) suggest as primary contributors to the emergence and growth of the collective bargaining movement.

Second, there are <u>specific issues</u> which appear to be related to the distinctive nature of the four types of postsecondary institutions. For example, the primary characteristic of research universities is the amount of federal support they receive for research activity and the number of Ph. D.'s they annually graduate (6). Attitudes toward such Research Opportunities as more time for research and better research facilities contributed significantly to the differentiation between AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty only at this one institutional type. Similarly, liberal arts colleges are characterized primarily by their greater teaching emphasis, and attitudes toward Teaching

Opportunities contributed significantly to the differentiation between bargaining organization members only at this type of institution. Comprehensive colleges and universities and two-year colleges and institutes tend to attract students with greater need for financial support and attitudes toward Institutional Aid Orientation contributed significantly to the differentiation between AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty at only these two types of institutions.[3]

These findings suggest that the relative importance of possible causes and consequences vary as a function of both the generalized concern of faculty toward external economic and social pressures and the specific pressures that result from the type of college or university in which they are employed. The complex resolution of these external and internal forces require further investigation in order to understand more fully the conditions which have contributed to the rapid growth of the collective bargaining movement.

Bargaining Organization Members. The relationship between individuals and organizations is a topic of both historical and current importance in the study of complex organizations (1, 2, 10, 19, 22, 26). Barrett (3) has demonstrated that the integration of individual goals and organizational objectives has important implications for both the individual and the organization. Holland (13) has shown that individuals have higher levels of achievement and satisfaction in organizations that are congruent with their personal competencies and values and that people search for organizations

---

3. Interestingly, the two variables relating to faculty perceptions about their success in (Success Orientation) and satisfaction with (Dissatisfaction Orientation) academic life did not contribute significantly to the differentiation between faculty associated with the three bargaining organizations. This suggests that the issues of major concern to collective bargaining members relate to more specific issues than to overall perceptions of success in and satisfaction with their careers and the academic life style.

that promote, reinforce, and reward their distinctive skills and attitudes. Conversely, they tend to leave organizations that are not supportive of their skills and values. This research has important implications for those who study and participate in the collective bargaining movement on campuses. For example, if bargaining organizations have distinctive histories and ideologies and their respective members have characteristics that are consistent with these distinctive roles and philosophies, it appears reasonable to assume that the relative strength of these organizations and their ability to attract and retain members would be related to the extent to which their efforts are consistent with the aspirations and values of their respective members.

With the notable exception of Ladd and Lipset's (16) study, the tendency of most research not to differentiate between members of the AAUP, AFT, and NEA has precluded the acquisition of knowledge about the distinctive characteristics of faculty affiliated with different bargaining organizations. The results of this study clearly demonstrate that there are wide variations in the aspirations and attitudes of AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty and that these overall differences are not consistent across different types of postsecondary institutions. For example, the higher mean score obtained by NEA faculty on Promotion Orientation than their AAUP and AFT colleagues at research universities and comprehensive colleges and universities, their AAUP colleagues at liberal arts colleges, and their AFT colleagues at two-year colleges and institutes indicates that they believe that teaching effectiveness, rather than publications, should be the primary criteria for promotion and tenure decisions and perceive that is, in fact, the case in their disciplines and institutions. They do not perceive that demands for research interfere with their teaching effectiveness or that it is difficult to achieve tenure if they do not publish

actively. This conclusion is also applicable for faculty affiliated with the AAUP at research universities who obtain a higher mean score on Promotion Orientation than AFT faculty at similar universities. Faculty affiliated with the NEA also place greater emphasis on the opportunities for higher academic rank and salary, tenure, and a better chance for professional advancement (Status Opportunities) in considering possible career opportunities than AAUP and AFT faculty at research universities and comprehensive colleges and universities and AAUP faculty at liberal arts colleges.

AFT faculty consider themselves to be more liberal (i.e., lower mean score on Conservative Orientation) than AAUP and NEA faculty at research universities and NEA faculty at comprehensive colleges and universities. This somewhat more liberal attitude of AFT faculty at these two types of post-secondary institutions is associated with their beliefs that there should be preferential hiring practices for minority and women faculty, students should have representation on institutional governing boards, and part-time faculty should be eligible for tenure. Faculty affiliated with the AFT also obtained a lower mean score on Institutional Aid Orientation than AAUP and NEA faculty at two-year colleges and institutes and NEA faculty at comprehensive colleges and universities, indicating that AFT faculty at these two types of post-secondary institutions believe that federal aid to students should be given directly to students rather than be channeled through institutions. In addition, AAUP and AFT faculty at research universities consider such Research Opportunities as more time for research and better research facilities as more important criteria in their consideration of career opportunities than NEA faculty; NEA faculty at comprehensive colleges and universities consider such Social Opportunities as better housing, better community, and better employment

opportunities for their spouses as less important career considerations than AAUP and AFT faculty; and NEA faculty at liberal arts colleges regard such Teaching Opportunities as less pressure to publish, fewer administrative responsibilities, and more opportunities to teach as more important criteria in their consideration of career opportunities than their AAUP colleagues at similar institutions.

Such diversity in the characteristics of AAUP, AFT, and NEA faculty at these four types of postsecondary institutions and the distinctive histories and ideologies of these organizations suggests that their respective operational goals, strategies, and tactics should be markedly different. This does not appear to be the case, however, since Kemerer and Baldridge note that despite rhetoric to the contrary, "the different bargaining agents are becoming more alike in their operational goals" and "their tactics and strategies will also grow to resemble each other" (15, p. 83). This contrast between the <u>diversity</u> of the roles and philosophies of bargaining organizations and the characteristics of their respective members and the <u>similarity</u> of their operational goals, strategies, and tactics has important implications for the future of the collective bargaining movement and deserves greater attention by those who study this phenomenon. Specifically, existing research on the relationship between individuals and organizations would suggest that the strength of a bargaining organization and its ability to attract and retain members is positively related to the degree to which that organization focuses its efforts on resolving those issues of primary concern to its members and incorporates the distinctive values of its members in its operational goals and strategies. This does not appear to be the case today since Lussier (21) concludes that there are wide variations in the stated positions of national bargaining

organizations and their respective local organizations. This study demonstrates that attempts to identify the distinctive values of faculty affiliated with the AAUP, AFT, and NEA must consider both the specific bargaining organization and the type of college or university in which the individual works. Such efforts might contribute to reducing the gap that apparently exists between the rhetoric and reality of most collective bargaining organizations.

ADDENDUM

A secondary objective of this study was to determine which collective bargaining organization would most likely be selected by faculty who were not affiliated with any bargaining organization if they were asked to choose between the AAUP, AFT, and NEA. A randomly selected sample of 100 nonaffiliated faculty at each of the four types of postsecondary institutions was obtained and multiple classification analysis (MCA) procedures were used to determine the most probable group membership of these nonaffiliated faculty. The predictor variables in the MCA were the nine standard scores derived from the factor analysis; the dependent variables were faculty affiliated with the AAUP, AFT, and NEA at each of the four types of postsecondary institutions.

Table 7 presents the probable group membership (AAUP, AFT, or NEA) of a random sample of 100 faculty in each of the four major institutional types who were not affiliated with any collective bargaining organization.

(Insert Table 7 about here)

Inspection of Table 7 suggested that a greater proportion of nonaffiliated faculty at research universities were likely to support the NEA (49 percent) than either the AAUP (30 percent) or the AFT (21 percent). The same conclusions appear to be warranted for nonaffiliated faculty at comprehensive colleges and universities since they were more similar to their NEA colleagues (47 percent) than either their AFT (31 percent) or AAUP (22 percent) colleagues. At liberal arts colleges, however, nonaffiliated faculty were more similar to AAUP faculty (59 percent) than their NEA colleagues (41 percent). The results

for nonaffiliated faculty at two-year colleges and institutes were not as conclusive as those for faculty at other types of colleges and universities. While more nonaffiliated faculty at two-year colleges and institutes were more similar to their NEA colleagues (39 percent) than either their AFT (31 percent) or AAUP (30 percent) colleagues, this rather even distribution did not support the development of strong conclusions.

REFERENCES

1. Argyris, C. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.
2. Barnard, C.I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.
3. Barrett, J.H. Individual Goals and Organizational Objectives: A Study of Integration Mechanisms. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan (Institute for Social Research), 1970.
4. Bayer, A.E. Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.
5. Birnbaum, R. "Unionization and Faculty Compensation." Educational Record, 55 (1974), - .
6. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Berkeley: Author, 1973.
7. Carr, R.K., and VanEyck, D.K. Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.
8. Cattell, R.B. "The Scree Test for the Number of Factors." Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1 (1966), 245-276.
9. Duryea, E.D., Fisk, R.S. and Associates (eds.). Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
10. Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
11. Garbarino, J.W. Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
12. Haehn, J.O. Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: An Empirical Analysis of California State Colleges. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1971.

13. Holland, J.L. Making Vocational Choices. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

14. Huberty, C.J. "Discriminent Analysis." Review of Educational Research, 45 (1975), 543-598.

15. Kemerer, F.R., and Baldridge, J.V. Unions on Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

16. Ladd, E.C., Jr., and Lipset, S.M. Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education. Berkeley: Carnegie Commission, 1973.

17. Leslie, D.W. Conflict and Collective Bargaining. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1975.

18. Light, D., Jr. "The Structure of the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education, 47 (1974), 2-28.

19. Likert, R. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

20. Lussier, V.L. National Faculty Associations in Collective Bargaining: A Comparative Discussion. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1974.

21. Lussier, V.L. "Faculty Bargaining Associations: National Objectives Versus Campus Contracts." Journal of Higher Education, 46 (1975), 507-518.

22. Perrow, C. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1972.

23. Rummel, R.J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

24. Schuster, J.H. (ed.). Encountering the Unionized University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

25. Tatsuoka, M.M. Multivariate Analysis: Techniques for Educational and Psychological Research. New York: Wiley, 1971.

26. Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press, 1947.

Table 1

Sample Sizes, Stratified by Collective Bargaining Organization and Institutional Affiliation

Institutional Affiliation	Collective Bargaining Organization			
	AAUP	AFT	NEA	TOTAL
Research universities	100	100	100	300
Comprehensive colleges and universities	100	100	100	300
Liberal arts colleges	100	*	100	200
Two-year colleges and institutes	41	100	100	241
TOTAL	341	300	400	1041

* This cell was deleted from the study because of an inadequate sample size (n = 10).

Table 2

Pattern Matrix of Nine Factor Oblique Solution

Variables	Rotated Factors[a]								
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
1. Higher salary	08	07	11	02	03	47	-01	-02	-02
2. Higher rank	02	-09	14	-07	01	71	-06	04	01
3. Tenure	05	03	09	-02	05	30	-21	15	-12
4. Less pressure to publish	-01	01	-12	-05	-03	12	-11	61	08
5. More time for research	-08	-03	84	07	-05	10	-09	03	01
6. Smaller teaching load	04	01	63	-01	01	04	16	12	-01
7. More opportunities to teach	13	-04	-07	08	01	02	14	57	03
8. Less administrative responsibility	06	02	24	09	-04	-17	-01	47	-10
9. More administrative responsibility	03	-01	-07	11	01	24	06	-12	18
10. Better students	41	09	27	-03	01	-05	-01	11	-02
11. Better colleagues	46	-01	20	01	-05	02	-06	08	08
12. Good job for spouse	34	-14	-04	-03	01	00	-08	-09	-0[illegible]
13. Better community	74	06	-08	04	-01	-03	03	04	04
14. Better schools for my children	60	01	-05	07	03	04	11	02	03
15. Better research facilities	27	01	55	05	03	10	-06	-08	-03

Table 2 (cont.)

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
16. Better chance for advancement	27	-09	14	-06	04	61	11	00	10
17. Better housing	63	07	-03	04	-02	20	07	09	00
18. Federal aid for undergraduates should be channeled through institutions rather than given directly to students	-02	01	-05	-02	87	03	02	00	-06
19. Federal aid for graduate students should be channeled through institutions rather than given directly to students	02	-03	-06	-01	90	02	-07	-04	-09
20. Jobs for new entrants into my discipline are harder to find today than five years ago	09	-04	04	-11	04	-12	-07	-03	01
21. In my department, it is very difficult to achieve tenure if one does not publish	-06	-05	-06	06	03	08	-70	19	09
22. Part-time faculty should be eligible for tenure	04	-30	-07	-08	-08	-01	-05	05	-02
23. Teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary basis for faculty promotion	03	-15	-22	-08	02	04	57	26	07
24. Faculty promotions should be based in part on formal student evaluations of their teachers	00	-38	-07	05	-03	00	14	04	02
25. Respect for the academic profession has declined over the past 20 years	03	08	09	-09	08	-04	-01	07	15
26. Undergraduates today study harder than those of four years ago	-04	-14	-04	08	04	02	00	-02	04

Table 2 (cont.)

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
27. Undergraduates today are more docile than those of four years ago	03	-06	05	04	02	-14	-03	-07	02
28. In my field, the male students comprehend the material better than the female students	03	16	01	04	04	-04	10	10	20
29. Students should have representation on the governing board of this institution	-02	-47	06	02	-04	11	14	02	02
30. The administration of my department is more democratic than authoritarian	-10	-03	03	08	07	-12	14	-01	-19
31. A university department's recruitment of its own former graduate students for faculty positions is generally detrimental to the development of a quality program	00	02	09	01	04	-05	-15	-07	14
32. I prefer to teach small classes	06	-11	09	-08	03	00	-01	16	-01
33. Institutional demands for doing research interfere with my effectiveness as a teacher	-05	-09	-05	-07	02	17	-37	37	19
34. I wish I had a smaller teaching load so I could devote more time to research	-09	-04	73	-07	-06	10	-02	-14	11
35. I consider myself a religious person	-07	09	-03	02	04	12	33	09	08
36. I consider myself politically conservative	-07	33	-05	04	12	15	24	09	14
37. Claims of discriminatory practices against women students have been greatly exaggerated	-02	47	-05	10	09	08	14	07	08

Table 2 (cont.)

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
38. There should be preferential hiring for minority faculty at this institution	-02	-78	08	00	01	-11	-05	06	-01
39. There should be preferential hiring for women faculty at this institution	-01	-81	09	-01	03	-07	-07	07	-02
40. Institutional antinepotism rules should be abolished	06	-22	01	-01	-03	-02	-11	-05	-02
41. If I had a chance to retrace my steps, I would not choose an academic life	05	01	00	-03	-03	-02	-05	00	64
42. If I had a chance to retrace my steps, I would choose another discipline	00	-05	05	01	-04	-02	-02	-01	62
43. Knowledge in my field is expanding so fast that I have fallen seriously behind	-01	-02	02	-10	01	-19	05	05	16
44. Compared with most men of my age in my field who have had comparable training, I have been more successful	09	05	03	90	01	-06	-11	06	-02
45. Compared with most women of my age in my field who have had comparable training, I have been more successful	06	-06	05	68	00	-06	-06	06	-03
Percent total variance	9	8	5	5	4	4	4	3	3
Percent common variance	20	18	11	11	9	9	9	7	7

Note. Decimals have been omitted.

[a]Factor Titles: I. Social Opportunities, II. Conservative Orientation, III. Research Opportunities, IV. Success Orientation, V. Institutional Aid Orientation, VI. Status Opportunities, VII. Promotion Orientation, VIII. Teaching Opportunities, IX. Dissatisfaction Orientation.

Table 3

Research Universities: Group Means and Step-down *F* Ratios

Variables	Group Means			Step-down F-Ratios[a]
	AAUP	AFT	NEA	
Promotion Orientation	-0.94	-1.22	-0.19	61.38***
Conservative Orientation	-0.15	-0.56	0.03	7.53***
Status Opportunities	-0.12	-0.16	0.41	5.64**
Research Opportunities	0.22	0.25	-0.27	3.95*
Success Orientation	-0.03	-0.05	0.13	2.22
Dissatisfaction Orientation	-0.06	0.00	0.23	1.96
Social Opportunities	0.05	0.28	-0.18	1.04
Institutional Aid Orientation	-0.03	-0.19	0.06	0.50
Teaching Opportunities	0.03	0.00	0.15	0.41

[a] *df* = 2/297

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 4

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities: Group Means and Step-down F-Ratios

Variables	Group Means			Step-down F-Ratios[a]
	AAUP	AFT	NEA	
Promotion Orientation	-0.15	-0.11	0.35	17.54***
Conservative Orientation	-0.01	-0.21	0.35	7.34***
Status Opportunities	-0.09	-0.10	0.23	4.52*
Social Opportunities	0.12	0.15	-0.25	4.22*
Institutional Aid Orientation	0.04	-0.18	0.26	3.15*
Dissatisfaction Orientation	-0.09	-0.06	0.06	1.78
Success Orientation	-0.11	-0.14	0.26	1.50
Research Opportunities	0.32	0.42	-0.08	1.20
Teaching Opportunities	-0.13	-0.06	0.00	0.16

[a] df = 2/297

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 5

Liberal Arts Colleges: Group Means and Step-down F-Ratios

Variables	Group Means		Step-down F-Ratios[a]
	AAUP	NEA	
Promotion Orientation	-0.13	0.55	65.10***
Status Opportunities	-0.25	0.03	9.17**
Teaching Opportunities	-0.22	0.10	3.95*
Research Opportunities	0.09	-0.11	2.75
Conservative Orientation	-0.21	0.09	1.90
Institutional Aid Orientation	-0.20	-0.03	1.32
Success Orientation	-0.20	-0.01	0.33
Social Opportunities	0.00	-0.08	0.24
Dissatisfaction Orientation	-0.10	0.02	0.05

[a] df = 1/198

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 6

Two-Year Colleges and Institutes: Group Means and Step-Down F-Ratios

Variables	Group Means			Step-down F-Ratios[a]
	AAUP	AFT	NEA	
Institutional Aid Orientation	0.12	-0.25	0.28	8.33***
Promotion Orientation	0.58	0.42	0.76	5.41**
Success Orientation	-0.10	-0.09	0.21	1.85
Status Opportunities	-0.01	-0.21	-0.03	1.29
Conservative Orientation	0.10	-0.19	0.25	0.79
Research Opportunities	-0.19	-0.26	-0.40	0.61
Dissatisfaction Orientation	0.01	-0.17	-0.02	0.25
Social Opportunities	-0.06	-0.03	-0.14	0.33
Teaching Opportunities	0.21	0.00	0.08	0.56

[a] $df = 2/238$

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 7

Most Probable Group Membership of Nonaffiliated Faculty by Institutional Type

Institutional Type of Nonaffiliated Faculty	Most Probable Bargaining Organization		
	AAUP	AFT	NEA
Research Universities	30	21	49
Comprehensive colleges and universities	22	31	47
Liberal arts colleges	59	*	41
Two-year colleges and institutes	30	31	39

* This cell was deleted from the study because of an inadequate sample size.